

A CANONICAL SEMI-DETERMINISTIC TRANSDUCER

ACHILLES A. BEROS AND COLIN DE LA HIGUERA

ABSTRACT. We prove the existence of a canonical form for semi-deterministic transducers with sets of pairwise incomparable output strings. Based on this, we develop an algorithm which learns semi-deterministic transducers given access to translation queries. We also prove that there is no learning algorithm for semi-deterministic transducers that uses only domain knowledge.

1. INTRODUCTION

Transducers, introduced by [29, 30], are a type of abstract machine which defines a relation between two formal languages. As such, they are interpreted as modeling translation in any context where formal languages are applicable. We provide no background on formal languages in this paper; an overview of the subject can be found in [8] and [33]. Alternatively, transducers can be viewed as a generalization of finite state machines. This view was introduced by Mohri, who uses transducers in the context of natural language processing [24, 25] and [26].

A fundamental task when studying the theory of transducers is to look for classes of transducers that can be learned given access to some form of data. If a class of transducers, $\mathcal{C}$, is found to be learnable, then a predictive model can be produced in any application where a translation from the class $\mathcal{C}$ is in use. The significance of transducers, specifically expanding the range of the learnable classes, is clear from the scope of applications of transducers. Among many others, some well known applications are in the fields of morphology and phonology [31], machine translation [3, 12, 14], web wrappers [9], speech [24] and pattern recognition [5]. In each of these cases, different classes of transducers are examined with characteristics suitable to the application. Distinguishing characteristics of different classes include determinism properties, the use of probabilities or weights, as well as details of the types of transitions that are permitted.

1.1. Transducer learning. An important step in the theory of transducers was the development of the algorithm OSTIA. Introduced in [27], OSTIA was designed for language comprehension tasks [13]. A number of elaborations on the original algorithm have since arisen, many of them aimed at trying to circumvent the restriction to total functions that limited OSTIA. Typically, these attempts involved adding some new source of information. For example, OSTIA-N uses negative (input) examples and OSTIA-D supposes the algorithm has some knowledge of the domain of the function [28]. Similar ideas were explored later by [20], [16] and [21]. An application of OSTIA for active learning is presented in [36]. Using dictionaries and word alignments has been tested by [37]. A demonstrated practical success of OSTIA came in 2006. The Tenjinno competition [34] was won by [15] using an OSTIA inspired algorithm.

Key words and phrases. Grammatical Inference, Semi-Deterministic Transducers.

1.2. Towards nondeterminism with transducers. Non-deterministic transducers pose numerous complex questions – even parsing becomes a difficult problem [10, 11]. Interest in non-deterministic models remains, however, as the limitations of subsequential transducers make them unacceptable for most applications. The first lifting of these constraints was proposed by [2]. They propose a model in which the final states may have multiple outputs. In his PhD thesis, Akram introduced a notion of semi-determinism [1] that strikes a balance between complete non-determinism and the very restrictive subsequential class. He provided an example witnessing that semi-deterministic transducers are a proper generalization of deterministic transducers, but did not pursue the topic further, focusing instead on probabilistic subsequential transducers. We examine an equivalent formulation of Akram’s semi-determinism based on methods of mathematical logic. In particular, by viewing the definition from a higher level of the ranked universe, we convert what would be a general relation into a well-defined function. [22] provides an overview of a number of important topics in set theory including the ranked and definable universes. Some more recent developments in set theory is [?].

A significant obstacle in learning non-deterministic transducers is the fact that an absence of information cannot be interpreted. One approach to overcoming this problem is to use probabilities. We eschew the probabilistic approach in favor of a collection of methods that have their antecedents in Beros’s earlier work distinguishing learning models [6] and determining the arithmetic complexity of learning models [7].

1.3. The learning model. There are two principal learning models in grammatical inference: identification in the limit [19] and PAC-learning [35]. Each of these models admits variants depending on what additional sources of information are provided. In order to learn semi-deterministic transducers, we use queries [4] as an additional resource. These queries are very limited; the oracle will be interrogated about a possible translation pair and the oracle will return either a TRUE OR FALSE. We also prove that learning is not possible without queries. We write $[x, X]_f$ to indicate a query if $\langle x, X \rangle$ is in the bi-language f . The precise definition of learning we use is adapted from the one used in [17]:

Definition 1.1. An algorithm, A , *polynomial identifies in the limit with translation queries* a class of transducers, $\mathcal{C}$, if for any $G \in \mathcal{C}$ there is a set, CS_G , such that on any $\mathcal{D} \supseteq CS_G$ generated by G , A outputs a G' equivalent to G . The algorithm must converge within a polynomial amount of time in $|\mathcal{D}|$ and $|G|$; $|CS_G|$ must be polynomial in $|G|$.

Note that in the above definition the number of calls to the oracle is also bounded by the overall complexity of the algorithm and is therefore polynomial in the size of the sample.

2. NOTATION

We make use of following common notation in the course of this paper. Throughout, the symbols x, y and z denote strings and a and b will denote elements of a given alphabet. We shall use the standard notation λ for the empty string.

- A tree is a directed acyclic graph. T' is a subtree of T if both T and T' are trees and T' is contained in T . A strict subtree is a subtree that is not equal to the containing tree.
- Given T , a tree, $T_x = \{z : xz \in T\}$. For a set of strings, S , $T[S]$ is the prefix closure of S .
- We write $x < y$ if there is a string z such that $y = xz$. We write $x \leq y$ if $x < y$ or $x = y$. This order is called the prefix order.
- $\mathcal{P}(X) = \{Y : Y \subseteq X\}$ and $\mathcal{P}^*(X) = \{Y : Y \subseteq X \wedge |Y| < \infty\}$.

- Following the notation of set theory, the string $x = a_0 \dots a_n$ is a function with domain $n + 1$. Thus, $x \upharpoonright k = a_0 \dots a_{k-1}$ for $k \leq n + 1$. $|x|$ is the length of x and x^- is the truncation $x \upharpoonright (|x| - 1)$. Note that the last element of x is $x(|x| - 1)$ and the last element of x^- is $x(|x| - 2)$.
- We write $x \parallel y$ if $x = y$, $x < y$ or $x > y$ and say x and y are comparable. Otherwise, we write $x \perp y$ and say that x and y are incomparable.
- By $<_{lex}$ and $<_{lex}$ we denote the lexicographic and length-lexicographic orders, respectively.
- $T[S] = \{x : (\exists y \in S)(x \leq y)\}$; in other words, $T[S]$ is the prefix closure of S .
- For an alphabet Σ , Σ^* is the set of all finite strings over Σ and $\Sigma_x^* = \{y \in \Sigma^* : y \geq x\}$. A tree over Σ is a tree whose members are members of Σ^* , where the ordering of the tree is consistent with the prefix order on Σ^* and the tree is prefix closed.
- We reserve a distinguished character, $\#$, which we exclude from all alphabets under consideration and we will use $\#$ to indicate the end of a word. We will write $x\#$ when we append the $\#$ character to x .

3. BI-LANGUAGES AND TRANSDUCERS

Bi-languages are the fundamental objects of study. They capture the semantic correspondence between two languages. In principle, this correspondence does not specify any ordering of the two languages, but translation is always done from one language to another language. As such, we refer to the input and the output languages of a bi-language. For notational simplicity, in everything that follows Σ is the alphabet for input languages and Ω is the alphabet for output languages. Using this notation, the input language is a subset of Σ^* and the output language is a subset of Ω^* . We now present the standard definition of a bi-language.

Definition 3.1. Consider two languages, $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and $K \subseteq \Omega^*$. A *bi-language from L to K* is a subset of $L \times K$.

For our purposes, we wish to indicate the direction of translation and to aggregate all translations of a single string. To this end, in the remainder of this paper, we will use the following equivalent definition of a bi-language.

Definition 3.2. Consider two languages, $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$ and $K \subseteq \Omega^*$. A *bi-language from L to K* is a function $f : L \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(K)$. L is said to be the *input language* and K the *output language* of f . When defined without reference to a specific output language, a bi-language is simply a function $f : L \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\Omega^*)$.

We are interested in languages whose generating syntax is some form of transducer.

Definition 3.3. A transducer is a finite state machine in which an output string is compiled from the outputs of transitions along the path that an input string follows through the machine. A transducer, G , consists of a finite set of *states*, written $\text{STATES}[G]$, a set of transitions, E , and a collection of initial states, $q_0, q_1, \dots, q_k$. A transition, $e \in E$, has four components: a start state, $\text{start}(e)$, an end state, $\text{end}(e)$, an input, $i(e)$ and an output, $o(e)$. There is a special type of transition called a *#-transition*. If e is a #-transition, then $\text{end}(e)$ is an initial state (by convention) and the input is $\#$. Termination of the processing of an input string occurs if and only if the final transition is a #-transition.

This paper addresses *semi-deterministic bi-languages* which are bi-languages generated by *semi-deterministic transducers*. These were defined in [1]. We use an equivalent formulation.

Definition 3.4. A *semi-deterministic transducer (SDT)* is a transducer with a unique initial state such that

- (1) $i(e) \in \Sigma$ for every transition e ,
- (2) given a state, q , and $a \in \Sigma$, there is at most one transition, e , with $start(e) = q$ and $i(e) = a$ and
- (3) given a transition, e , $o(e)$ is a finite set of pairwise incomparable strings in Ω^* (i.e., $o(e) \in \mathcal{P}^*(\Omega^*)$).

When it is necessary to refer to a transition as a single tuple, we will write the components in the following order: $\langle start(e), end(e), i(e), o(e) \rangle$. A *semi-deterministic bi-language (SDBL)* is a bi-language that can be generated by an SDT.

Two useful properties of SDTs follow from the definition. First, if $e \in E$ and $\lambda \in o(e)$, then $o(e) = \{\lambda\}$. Second, although there may be multiple translations of a single string, every string follows a unique path through an SDT. We must also note that, while SDBLs can be infinite, the image of any member or finite subset of L is finite. Thus, an SDBL is a function $f : L \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*(\Omega^*)$.

Definition 3.5. Let G be an SDT with input language L . A *path through G* is a string $e_0 \dots e_k \in E^*$, where E is the set of transitions, such that $start(e_{i+1}) = end(e_i)$ for $i < k$. $G[p]$ is the collection of all outputs of G that can result from following path p . p_x is the unique path through G defined by $x \in \Sigma^*$. If $x \in L$, then we assume p_x ends with a $\#$ -transition. We denote the final state of the path p_x by q_x .

4. ORDERING MAXIMAL ANTICHAINS

The following definitions and results pertain to sets of strings and trees over finite alphabets.


Definition 4.1. Given a set of strings, S , we call $P \subseteq T[S]$ a *maximal antichain of S* if $(\forall x, y \in P)(x \perp y)$ and $(\forall x \in S)(\exists y \in P)(y \parallel x)$. P is a *valid antichain of S* if P is a maximal antichain of S and $(\forall x, y \in P)(T[S]_x = T[S]_y)$. We define, $\text{Vac}(S) = \{P : P \text{ is a valid antichain of } S\}$.

Example 4.2. Consider the following set of strings over the alphabet $\{a, b\}$:


$$S = \{a^5, a^4b, a^2ba, a^2b^2, ba^4, ba^3b, baba, bab^2, b^2a^3, b^2a^2b, b^3a, b^4\}.$$

Graphically, we can represent S as a tree where branching left indicates an a and branching right indicates a b . In the picture below to the right, we highlight the four valid antichains of S : $P_0 = \{\lambda\}$, $P_1 = \{a^2, ba, b^2\}$, $P_2 = \{a^4, a^2b, ba^3, bab, b^2a^2, b^3\}$ and $P_3 = S$. Note that S is only a valid antichain of itself because it contains no comparable strings. The members of the four valid antichains are connected via dotted lines in the right picture (P_0 has only one member and therefore includes no dotted lines). For reference a maximal antichain that is not valid is included in the picture on the left and its members are joined with a

dotted line.



In the next picture, we focus on the valid antichain P_1 .



Observe that the portions of the tree below each of a^2 , ba and b^2 are identical; the terminal nodes of all three sub-trees are $\{a^3, a^2b, ab, b^2\}$. It is this equivalence of suffixes that makes P_1 a valid antichain.

It is interesting to note that the valid antichains in the above example have a natural linear ordering. As we shall see in Theorem 4.9, this is not an artifact of the particular example, but is true of any finite set S .

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that P is a valid antichain of a set of strings S and Q is a valid antichain of P , then Q is a valid antichain of S .*

Proof. The proposition follows immediately from Definition 4.1. $\square$

Definition 4.4. For P and Q , sets of strings over some common alphabet, we say that $P <_{ac} Q$ (P is “antichain less than” Q) if either

- $|P| < |Q|$, or
- $|P| = |Q|$ and, for all $x \in P$ and $y \in Q$, if $x \parallel y$, then $x < y$.

We will use valid antichains to parse a set of strings as one would parse a single string into a prefix and suffix. The validity of an antichain ensures that the corresponding suffix set is well-defined. When parsing sets of strings, we will often use the following operations.

Definition 4.5. Let S and P be two sets of strings.

- $P * S = \{xy : x \in P \wedge y \in S\}$.
- $P^{-1}S = \{y : (\exists x \in P)(xy \in S)\}$.

Proposition 4.6. *$*$ is associative, but is not commutative.*

Proof. Associativity follows from Definition 4.5. To see that $*$ is not commutative, consider $P = \{a\}$ and $B = \{a, b\}$. $A * B = \{aa, ab\}$ and $B * A = \{aa, ba\}$. $\square$

Proposition 4.7. *Let S be a finite set of strings. If P is a valid antichain of S , then $P * (P^{-1}S) = S$.*

Proof. Observe that, if P is a valid antichain of S , then $T[P^{-1}S] = T[S]_x$ for all $x \in P$. $\square$

The antichain ordering ($<_{ac}$) has particularly nice properties when applied to $\text{Vac}(S)$, where S is a finite set of strings.

Proposition 4.8. *If P and Q are maximal antichains of the same finite set of strings, then there is a relation $R \subseteq P \times Q$ such that*

- $\text{dom}(R) = P$,
- $\text{ran}(R) = Q$,
- $xRy \leftrightarrow x \parallel y$.

Furthermore, if $|P| = |Q|$, then R is a well-defined and injective function.

Proof. Define $R = \{\langle x, y \rangle : x \in P \wedge y \in Q \wedge x \parallel y\}$. Since P and Q are maximal antichains, for each $x \in P$ there is $y \in Q$ such that $x \parallel y$ hence, $\text{dom}(R) \supseteq P$. Similarly, for each $y \in Q$ there is an $x \in P$ such that $x \parallel y$ thus, $\text{ran}(R) \supseteq Q$. By the definition of R , $\text{dom}(R) \subseteq P$, $\text{ran}(R) \subseteq Q$ and $xRy \leftrightarrow x \parallel y$. $\square$

Theorem 4.9. *If S is a finite set of strings, then $(\text{Vac}(S), <_{ac})$ is a finite linear order.*

Proof. Consider a finite set of strings, S , and let $T = T[S]$. We begin by fixing $P, Q \in \text{Vac}(S)$. We may assume that $|P| = |Q|$; if $|P| \neq |Q|$ then the claim is trivial. We pick an element $x \in P$ and observe that, by Proposition 4.8, there is a unique $y \in Q$ such that $x \parallel y$.

Suppose that $x = y$ and let x' be any other member of P . By Proposition 4.8, there is a unique $y' \in Q$ such that $x' \parallel y'$. Since P and Q are valid antichains and $x = y$, $T_{x'} = T_x = T_y = T_{y'}$. Given that $x' \parallel y'$, T is finite and $T_{x'} = T_{y'}$ we conclude that $x' = y'$. Now assume $x < y$. In the case $y < x$ simply exchange the roles of x and y . As above, we pick $x' \in P$ and its unique comparable element $y' \in Q$. Clearly T_y is a strict subtree of T_x and hence, $T_{y'}$ is a strict subtree of $T_{x'}$. We conclude that $x' < y'$.

We have shown that any two members of $\text{Vac}(S)$ are comparable. The remaining order properties follow immediately from the definitions. $\square$

While the proof of Theorem 4.9 is quite simple, we highlight it as a theorem because it is the critical result for the applications of valid antichains that follow. Note that $<_{ac}$ may not be a linear order on an arbitrary collection of maximal antichains.

Corollary 4.10. *Let $S_0, S_1, S_2, \dots$ be a sequence of finite sets. $\bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Vac}(S_i)$ is linearly ordered under $<_{ac}$.*


Proof. Any subset of a linear order is a linear order. Since $\bigcap_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Vac}(S_i) \subseteq \text{Vac}(S_0)$, the claim follows. $\square$

Definition 4.11. Given a set of strings, S , a finite sequence of sets of strings, $P_0, \dots, P_n$, is a *factorization* of S if $S = P_0 * \dots * P_n$. Such a factorization is said to be *maximal* if, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\text{Vac}(P_i) = \{\{\lambda\}, P_i\}$; equivalently, if P_{i+1} is the $<_{ac}$ -least non-trivial valid antichain of $P_i^{-1} \dots P_0^{-1}S$.


Example 4.12. We consider the following set of strings:

$$S = \{a^5, a^4b, a^3ba^2, a^3bab, a^3b^2a, a^3b^3, aba^2, abab, ab^2a^2, ab^2ab, ab^3a, ab^4, ba^4, ba^3b, ba^2ba^2, ba^2bab, ba^2b^2a, ba^2b^3, b^2a^2, b^2ab, b^3a^2, b^3ab, b^4a^2, b^4ab, b^5a, b^6\}.$$

In the figure below, we display the tree, $T[S]$, as well as the $<_{ac}$ -least non-trivial valid antichain, $P_0 = \{a, b\}$.



The corresponding set of suffixes is $P_0^{-1}S = \{a^4, a^3b, a^2ba^2, a^2bab, a^2b^2a, a^2b^3, ba^2, bab, b^2a^2, b^2ab, b^3a, b^4\}$. Iterating, we find the next factor is $P_1 = \{a^2, b\}$ and its set of suffixes is $(P_0 * P_1)^{-1}S = \{a^2, ab, ba^2, bab, b^2a, b^3\}$.



We next pick $P_2 = \{a, ab, b^2\}$. Once we factor out P_2 , all that remains is $\{a, b\}$. The only antichains of $\{a, b\}$ are $\{\lambda\}$ and $\{a, b\}$, both of which are valid antichains. We pick the final factor to be $P_3 = \{a, b\}$ and conclude that $P_0 * P_1 * P_2 * P_3$ is a maximal factorization of S .

Corollary 4.13. *Every finite set of strings has a unique maximal factorization.*

Proof. Let S be a finite set of strings. We will apply the iterative process illustrated in Example 4.12 to S . Define P_0 to be the $<_{ac}$ -least non-trivial valid antichain of S . If $P_0 = S$, then the process is complete. By Theorem 4.9, the choice of P_0 is unique. Suppose we have defined $P_0, P_1, \dots, P_n$. Let $S_n = P_n^{-1} \cdots P_0^{-1}S$. To be explicit, $S_n = P_n^{-1}(P_{n-1}^{-1}(\cdots(P_0^{-1}S)))$. Define P_{n+1} to be the $<_{ac}$ -least non-trivial valid antichain of S_n . As before, the choice is unique. If $P_{n+1} = S_n$, then the process is complete. Otherwise, we proceed to the next iteration.

Since $\text{Vac}(S)$ is finite, the process must terminate. The uniqueness of the factorization follows from the uniqueness of the choices made at each stage of the process. $\square$

5. SEMI-DETERMINISTIC BI-LANGUAGES

We cover three topics in this section: onwarding, merging, and the non-learnability of SDBLs. Onwarding is the process of moving decisions earlier in the identification process and merging is the process of conflating identical portions of a learning machine.

Taken together, onwarding and merging prove the existence of a canonical SDT for each SDBL. Onwarding yields a “maximal” function on prefixes of the input language. Merging produces a finite-order equivalence relation on those prefixes. Together, they will allow us to define a canonical grammar for an arbitrary SDBL. We demonstrate that, given only domain knowledge, SDBLs are not learnable. In section 6, we prove that SDBLs are learnable given access to an additional, very limited, oracle.

5.1. Onwarding.

Definition 5.1. Let f be an SDBL. $F : T[L] \rightarrow \mathcal{P}^*(\Omega^*)$ is a *semi-deterministic function* (SDF) of f if, for $x \in L$, $f(x) = F(x \upharpoonright 1) * F(x \upharpoonright 2) * \dots * F(x) * F(x\#)$. We define $\Pi F(x) = F(x \upharpoonright 1) * F(x \upharpoonright 2) * \dots * F(x)$. If F and F' are SDFs of f , we say that $F <_{sdf} F'$ if $\Pi F(x)$ is a valid antichain of $\Pi F'(x)$ for all x . The SDF *induced* by f is the SDF, F , such that $F(x) = \{\lambda\}$ for all $x \in T[L]$ and $F(x\#) = f(x)$ for all $x \in L$.

Example 5.2. Suppose that $A, B, C \subseteq \Omega^*$ are finite and non-empty. Let $\Sigma = \{a\}$ be the input alphabet. Define an SDBL, f , over $L = \{a^2\}$ by $f(a^2) = A * B * C$. We define two incomparable SDFs of f as follows. The first SDF: $F(\lambda) = \{\lambda\}$, $F(a) = A * B$, $F(a^2) = \{\lambda\}$ and $F(a^2\#) = C$. The second SDF: $F'(\lambda) = \{\lambda\}$, $F'(a) = A$, $F'(a^2) = B * C$ and $F'(a^2\#) = \{\lambda\}$. Since $\Pi F(a)$ is not a valid antichain of $\Pi F'(a)$, $F \not<_{sdf} F'$. Likewise, since $\Pi F'(a^2)$ is not a valid antichain of $\Pi F(a^2)$, $F' \not<_{sdf} F$.

Example 5.2 demonstrates that $<_{sdf}$ is not a linear ordering of the SDFs of a fixed SDBL. Nonetheless, there is a $<_{sdf}$ -maximum SDF of f .

Theorem 5.3. *If f is an SDBL, then there is a $<_{sdf}$ -maximum SDF of f .*

Proof. For $x \in T[L]$, let S be the collection of all members of L that extend x and let x_0 be the $<_{lex}$ -least member of S . By Corollary 4.13, for every $y \in S$ there is a unique maximal factorization of $f(y)$. Let $P_0 * \dots * P_n$ denote the unique maximal factorization of $f(x_0)$. Let $P_0 * \dots * P_i$ be the longest common initial segment of all factorizations of members of S (note that as the $*$ -operation is not commutative, the distinct members of a factorization also have a unique order). We define P^x to be the product of this longest common factorization.

We define $F_m(\lambda) = \{\lambda\}$ and proceed through the members of $T[L]$ in $<_{lex}$ -order. Suppose we are considering $x \in T[L]$ and all $<_{lex}$ lesser members have already been addressed. We define $F_m(x) = (\Pi F_m(x^-))^{-1} P^x$. If $y \in L$ and $F_m(y)$ is defined, we set $F_m(y\#) = (\Pi F_m(y))^{-1} f(y)$.

If $x < y$, then $\Pi F_m(x)$ is a valid antichain of $F_m(y)$ and $(F_m(y))^{-1} f(y)$ is well-defined. Consequently, F_m is a well defined function with domain $T[L]$. If F is any SDF of f and x is an arbitrary member of $T[L]$, then $\Pi F(x), \Pi F_m(x) \in \text{Vac}(f(\hat{x}))$. By Theorem 4.9, $\Pi F(x)$ and $\Pi F_m(x)$ are $<_{ac}$ -comparable. Furthermore, $\Pi F(x), \Pi F_m(x) \in \text{Vac}(f(y))$ for all $y > x$. Given the construction of F_m , it is clear that $F(x) \leq_{ac} F_m(x)$, proving that F_m is a $<_{sdf}$ -maximum SDF of f . $\square$

5.2. Merging. The second phase of building a canonical form for SDTs is to define an equivalence relation on the domain of a maximum SDF. This means identifying which paths lead to the same state.

Definition 5.4. Let F be an SDF of f over L and $x \in T[L]$. We define $\text{FUTURE}_F[x] = F \upharpoonright \{y \in T[L] : y > x\}$. If $x, y \in \text{dom}(F)$, we say that $x \equiv y$ if $\text{FUTURE}_F[x] = \text{FUTURE}_F[y]$. Given x , we define $\text{can}(x)$ to be the $<_{lex}$ -least element of $\text{dom}(F)$ that is equivalent to x .

Proposition 5.5.

- (1) $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation on the domain of an SDF.
- (2) If $x \equiv y$ and $xz, yz \in T[L]$, then $xz \equiv yz$.
- (3) If F is an SDF of f over L , then there are only a finite number of $\equiv$ -equivalence classes on the domain of F .

Proof. Part 1 follows from the fact that equality is an equivalence relation. Part 2 follows from the definition of $\equiv$. To prove part 3, let G be an SDT that generates f and let q_x be a state of G which can be reached by the input string $x \in T[L]$. For any $y \in T[L]$, if p_y leads to q_x , then $x \equiv y$ as their futures are the same. Thus, $\equiv$ induces an equivalence relation on (hence, a partition of) the states of G . Since there is at least one state in each equivalence class, the fact that $|\text{STATES}[G]| < \infty$ implies that there are only finitely many equivalence classes. $\square$

Lemma 5.6. *Let F be an SDF of f over L . There is an n such that for all $x, y \in T[L]$, $x \equiv y$ if and only if $\text{FUTURE}[x] \upharpoonright x\Sigma^n = \text{FUTURE}[y] \upharpoonright y\Sigma^n$.*

Proof. The proof follows immediately from Proposition 5.5, part 3. Since there are only a finite number of possible futures, there is a finite portion of each that uniquely identifies it. Let n be the maximum depth of the paths required to obtain the identifying portion of each future. We have obtained the desired n . $\square$

We can think of the identifying bounded future of an equivalence class as a sort of signature, an analogue of the famous locking sequence for Gold style learning.

The maximum SDF and the equivalence relation on its domain depend only on the underlying SDBL. Thus, we have defined a machine-independent canonical form. As a footnote, we demonstrate here how to produce an SDT from the canonical form which is unique up to isomorphism. Let f be an SDBL, let F_m be the maximum SDF for f and let $\equiv$ be the equivalence relation on the domain of F_m . We define a finite state machine, G_f , as follows:

- $\text{STATES}[G_f] = \{q_{(x)} : x \in T[L]\}$
- The initial state is q_λ .
- $E_{G_f} = \{\langle q_{(x^-)}, q_{(x)}, x(|x| - 1), F_m(x) \rangle : x \in T[L]\} \cup \{\langle q_{(x)}, q_\lambda, \#, F_m(x\#) \rangle : x \in L\}$

Although L and $T[L]$ may be infinite sets, the set of transitions, E_{G_f} , and the set of states, $\text{STATES}[G_f]$, are finite by Proposition 3.

Proposition 5.7. *Let f be an SDBL. G_f is an SDT that generates f .*

Proof. Clearly, G_f is a finite state transducer. A set of strings, $S = P_0 * \dots * P_n$, consists of incomparable strings if and only if all of its factors consist of incomparable strings. Thus, the outputs of all transitions of G_f consist of incomparable strings, as they are factors of the elements of the range of f .

We must show that G_f generates f . G_f and f have the same domain. Let F_m be the maximal SDF of f . If $x \in T[L]$, then $G_f[p_x] = \Pi F_m(x)$, thus, G_f generates f . $\square$


5.3. SDBLs are not learnable. We assume domain knowledge (i.e., access to the characteristic function of the input language). In the proof of the following theorem, we encode a standard example of a “topological” failure of learning in the limit. In particular, we encode the family $\mathcal{H} = \{\mathbb{N}\} \cup \{A : |A| < \infty\}$ into a sequence of SDTs.

Definition 5.8. Let f be a bi-language. We define DK_f to be the oracle that, when asked about x , returns a boolean value $DK_f(x)$. If $DK_f(x) = \text{TRUE}$, then x is in the input language

of f (in other words, the domain of f). Otherwise, x is not in the input language of f . An algorithm which has access to DK_f is said to have domain knowledge about f .

Theorem 5.9. *There is a collection of SDBLs, C , such that no algorithm limit learns every member of C , even given domain knowledge of each member of C .*

Proof. To avoid degenerate cases, we assume the output alphabet has at least two characters, A and B , and the input alphabet has at least one character, a . We exhibit a sequence of SDTs, $\{G_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, such that no program can successfully learn every member of the sequence. In the following graphical representation of $\{G_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ we omit the $\#$ -transitions, instead indicating terminal nodes with a double border.



Let f_i be the SDBL generated by the SDT G_i . Fix any learning algorithm and let M be the function such that, given data $\mathcal{D}$, the hypothesis made by the learning algorithm is $M(\mathcal{D})$. We inductively define an enumeration of a bi-language generated by some member of the sequence, $\{G_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Define $X_i = \langle a^i, A^i \rangle \langle a^i, B^i \rangle$ and $X_i^j = \langle a^j, A^j \rangle \langle a^{j+1}, A^{j+1} \rangle \dots \langle a^{j+i}, A^{j+i} \rangle$. Let n_1 be least such that $M(X_1 X_{n_1}^1)$ codes G_1 . If no such n_1 exists, then there is an enumeration of f_1 which the chosen algorithm fails to identify. Thus, without loss of generality, we may assume such an n_1 exists. Similarly, we pick n_2 to be least such that $M(X_1 X_{n_1}^1 X_2 X_{n_2}^2)$ codes G_2 . Proceeding in this fashion, either we reach a stage where some n_k cannot be found and the algorithm has failed to learn f_k or we have built an enumeration of G_0 on which the algorithm changes its hypothesis an infinite number of times. In either case, learning has failed. $C = \{f_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is the desired collection of SDBLs. $\square$

6. LEARNING WITH TRANSLATION QUERIES

We define an oracle which answers questions of the form “is y a valid translation of x ?”; equivalently, the oracle answers membership queries about the graph of the bi-language.

Definition 6.1. Let f be a bi-language. The translation query $[x, y]_f$ returns **TRUE** if $y \in f(x)$ and **FALSE** otherwise. We call this oracle $[f]$. Where it is clear from context, we will write $[x, y]$ instead of $[x, y]_f$.

In the remainder of the paper, we exhibit an algorithm that can learn any SDBL, f , in the limit, provided the algorithm has access to the oracles DK_f and $[f]$. We present the algorithms that witness the learnability of SDBLs and summarize the result in Theorem 6.3.


6.1. The characteristic sample. The characteristic sample must contain sufficient data to unambiguously perform two operations: onwarding and merging. Throughout this section f is an SDBL over L and G is the canonical SDT that generates f . We define $\hat{x}$ to be the $<_{lex}$ -least member of L that extends x . We now proceed to define the characteristic sample for f , denoted CS_f .

The first component of the characteristic sample provides the data required to recognize which maximal antichains of a set of translations are not valid. In order to illustrate the concept, consider $f(a\#)$, the translations along a path involving only one non- $\#$ transition.

Let X be the $<_{lex}$ -member of $f(a\#)$. Every maximal antichain of $f(a\#)$ contains a prefix of X and every prefix of X is a member of at most one element of $\text{Vac}(f(a\#))$. If X_0 is a prefix of X that is not in a valid antichain, then there is a $Z \in f(a\#)$ such that for any $Z_0 < Z$, either

- (1) there is a Z_1 such that $Z_0Z_1 \in f(a\#)$ and $X_0Z_1 \notin f(a\#)$, or
- (2) there is a X_1 such that $X_0X_1 \in f(a\#)$ and $Z_0X_1 \notin f(a\#)$.

In other words, X_0 and Z_0 have different futures. Thus, for each prefix which is not an element of a valid antichain, there is a translation pair that witnesses this fact. The following figure illustrates the two cases with the possible witnessing strings marked by dashed lines.



To describe the required information in the general case, let $x_0, \dots, x_n$ enumerate the minimal paths to each of the states of G and fix $i \leq n$. If $|x_i| > 0$, let P be the $<_{ac}$ -greatest member of $\text{Vac}(f(x_i^-y))$ for all y such that $x_i^-y \in L$; if $|x_i| = 0$, define $P = \{\lambda\}$. Define X to be the $<_{lex}$ -least member of $P^{-1}f(\hat{x}_i)$. For each $X_0 < X$ that is not a member of a valid antichain of $P^{-1}f(\hat{x}_i)$, there is a $Y \in P^{-1}f(\hat{x}_i)$ no prefix of which has the same future in $P^{-1}f(\hat{x}_i)$ as X_0 and there is a translation in $f(\hat{x}_i)$ witnessing the different futures. We denote the set of such witnessing translation pairs, one for each prefix of X not in a valid antichain, by S_i . Let Z be the $<_{lex}$ -least member of P . Let $N_0(x_i) = \{\langle \hat{x}_i, ZX \rangle\} \cup S_i$ and define $N_0(f) = \bigcup_{i \leq n} N_0(x_i)$. Observe that $N_0(f)$ is polynomial in the size of G .

Consider $x \in T[L]$. Let $\text{Vac} = \bigcap_{x < y \in L} \text{Vac}(f(y))$. For each $P \in \text{Vac}(f(x)) \setminus \text{Vac}$, observe that there is an example that witnesses the fact that P is not in Vac . Such examples demonstrate violations of either the maximality or the validity of the given antichain. In either case, the witness is a single element of the graph of f (a paired string and translation). Since $\text{Vac}(f(x))$ is finite, the number of examples needed to eliminate all incorrect maximal antichains is also finite. We define $N_1(x)$ to be the set which consists of exactly one example for each member of $\text{Vac}(f(x)) \setminus \text{Vac}$. For the sake of a unique definition, we assume that we always choose the $<_{lex}$ -least example – although this is not essential. We can now define the second component of CS_f : $N_1(f) = \bigcup_{q \in \text{STATES}[G]} N_1(\hat{x}_q)$.

N_0 and N_1 are required to perform onwarding correctly. In order to perform merges, we must include enough data to identify the equivalence classes of states whose futures are the same. There are two ways in which the futures may differ:

- (1) there is a string z , such that $xz \in L$, but $yz \notin L$ or
- (2) for $X \in G[p_x]$ and $Y \in G[p_y]$, there are z and Z such that $XZ \in G[p_{xz}]$, but $YZ \notin G[p_{yz}]$.

For each member of $\text{STATES}[G]$ there is a finite collection of examples which uniquely identify the state. Let $N_2(q_x)$ be a canonically chosen collection of such examples for q_x . Let e be a transition and $\hat{p}$ be the $<_{lex}$ -least path starting at the initial state, ending with a $\#$ -transition and including e . Define $N_2^*(e)$ to be the set of those translations of $\hat{p}$ each of which uses a different output of the transition e and is $<_{lex}$ -least amongst the translations

of $\hat{p}$ that use that output. $|N_2^*(e)| = |o(e)|$. We define the final component of CS_f as follows.

$$N_2(f) = \bigcup_{x \in W} N_2(q_x) \cup \bigcup_{e \in E_G} N_2^*(e),$$

where W consists of the minimal paths to each state of G as well as all paths that are immediate extensions of those paths.

Definition 6.2. For an SDBL, f , we define the characteristic sample of f , $CS_f = N_0(f) \cup N_1(f) \cup N_2(f)$.

6.2. Algorithms. In all the algorithms that follow, loops over prefixes of a string will proceed in order of increasing length. Also, when a subroutine returns multiple outputs (e.g., returns all the elements of an array) we assume that an appropriate loop is executed to load the returned values into the selected variables in the main program.

6.2.1. Initializing the transducer. Consider a dataset, $\mathcal{D}$. We define an initial transducer by creating a state for every member of $T[\text{dom}(\mathcal{D})]$. A tree-like transducer is produced where all transitions output only λ except for the $\#$ -transitions at members of $\text{dom}(\mathcal{D})$. All outputs in the dataset are assigned to the $\#$ -transitions.

Algorithm 1: Forming the initial tree-like transducer (INITIAL)

Data: A collection of translation pairs, $\mathcal{D}$.

Result: A tree-like SDT, $G_{\mathcal{D}}$.

```

for  $\langle x, X \rangle \in \mathcal{D}$  do
    STATES[ $G_{\mathcal{D}}$ ]  $\cup \{q_x\} \rightarrow \text{STATES}[G_{\mathcal{D}}]$ 
     $E_{G_{\mathcal{D}}} \cup \{e_x^{\#} = \langle q_x, q_{\lambda}, \#, X \rangle\} \rightarrow E_{G_{\mathcal{D}}}$ 
    if  $x \neq \lambda$  then
        for  $y < x$  do
            STATES[ $G_{\mathcal{D}}$ ]  $\cup \{q_y\} \rightarrow \text{STATES}[G_{\mathcal{D}}]$ 
             $E_{G_{\mathcal{D}}} \cup \{e_y = \langle q_y, q_y, y(|y| - 1), \lambda \rangle\} \rightarrow E_{G_{\mathcal{D}}}$ 
return  $G_{\mathcal{D}}$ 

```

The transducer that results from a run of Algorithm 1 recognizes the translations in $\mathcal{D}$ and no other translations.

6.2.2. Generating an array of all valid antichains. In order to simplify the presentation of the algorithms, we will not include the algorithms for several simple functions. In particular, we will assume that $LEXORDER(A)$ takes an array, A , as an input and returns an array with the same contents as A , but in lexicographic order. $LLEXORDER(A)$ performs the same function, but for the $<_{lex}$ -ordering. $LEX-LEAST$ and $LLEX-LEAST$ will be applied to sets and arrays and will return the $<_{lex}$ - and $<_{llex}$ -least member, respectively. For sets of strings P and S , we will use the operations $P^{-1}S$ and $P * S$ as built-in arithmetic operations. Given an input string, x , output strings, Z and W , and a set of translation pairs, $\mathcal{D}$, the function $COMPARE(x, Z, W, \mathcal{D})$ returns **TRUE** if, for every $\langle x, ZR \rangle, \langle x, WS \rangle \in \mathcal{D}$, the queries $[x, WR]_f$ and $[x, ZS]_f$ return values of **TRUE**. Otherwise, $COMPARE(x, Z, W, \mathcal{D})$ returns **FALSE**. Applying the same notation used above, if x is an input string, then $\hat{x}$ is the $<_{llex}$ -least member of L extending x . Using these functions, we define an algorithm to

create a list of all valid antichains when considering the tree of outputs of a single input string.

Algorithm 2: List the valid antichains (VAC)

Data: A collection of translation pairs, $\mathcal{D}$; $x \in L$; X_ℓ , the current least translation prefix for x .

Result: An array, A , of all maximal antichains of the translations of x in $\mathcal{D}$ which extend X_ℓ and are not demonstrably invalid.

$X_\ell^{-1}\{Y : Y > X_\ell \wedge \langle x, Y \rangle \in \mathcal{D}\} \rightarrow T$

$LLEX - LEAST(T) \rightarrow Z$

for $\hat{Z} < Z$ **do**

$\hat{Z} \rightarrow AC[0]$

for $R \in T \wedge R \neq Z$ **do**

for $\hat{R} < R$ **do**

$COMPARE(x, X_\ell \hat{Z}, X_\ell \hat{R}, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow status$

if $status = \text{TRUE}$ **then**

$\hat{R} \rightarrow AC[|AC|]$

break

if $status = \text{FALSE}$ **then**

break


if $status = \text{TRUE}$ **then**

$AC \rightarrow A[|A|]$

return A

One of the inputs of Algorithm 2 is the “current least translation prefix of x ”. The current translation prefix will converge to the $<_{llex}$ -least output string generated along the unique path corresponding to x . X_ℓ provides a canonical output prefix for testing outputs using translation queries.

The first step of Algorithm 2 restricts $\mathcal{D}$ to the tree of translation pairs whose second component extends the least translation prefix. Every antichain of the tree must contain a prefix of the $<_{llex}$ -least member of the tree. Because of the linear ordering of the valid antichains (see Theorem 4.9), there is at most one valid antichain for each prefix of the least member of the tree. $COMPARE$ is used to look for matching nodes to form valid antichains.



As can be seen in the figure, all valid antichains include prefixes of the $<_{llex}$ -least member and no two valid antichains contain the same prefix. This provides both a bound on the number of valid antichains and a convenient method to search for the valid antichains.

6.2.3. Performing onwarding on a single node. The next algorithm takes an array of antichains and produces the $<_{ac}$ -greatest antichain that appears to be a valid antichain of all

trees of outputs on inputs extending x . As the data may still be incomplete, testing the validity for other trees is done using translation queries.

Algorithm 3: Testing an array of antichains against a dataset (TESTVPS)

Data: A string, x , over the input alphabet; an array, A , of antichains for the output tree of input $\hat{x}$; a collection of translation pairs, $\mathcal{D}$.

Result: The $<_{ac}$ -greatest member of the array, A , for which there is no evidence in $\mathcal{D}$ that the selected antichain is not valid for all output trees in the future of x .

```

for  $i = |A| - 1; i \geq 0; i--$  do
  'not valid'  $\rightarrow$   $status$ 
  for  $\langle xy, Z \rangle \in \mathcal{D}$  do
    for  $R \in A[i]$  do
      if  $R < Z$  then
         $R^{-1}Z \rightarrow W$ 
        'valid'  $\rightarrow$   $status$ 
        for  $Q \in A[i]$  do
          if  $[xy, QW]_f = \text{FALSE}$  then
            'not valid'  $\rightarrow$   $status$ 
            break
          if  $status = \text{'not valid'}$  then
            break
      if  $status = \text{'valid'}$  then
        return  $A[i]$ 

```

Observe that there will always be a valid antichain that causes the above algorithm to terminate; if there is no other, then it will terminate on $\{\lambda\}$.

Algorithm 4: Onwarding a tree-like portion of a transducer (ONWARD)

Data: A string x ; a transducer, G , which is tree-like below a string, x ; X_ℓ , the current least translation prefix for x ; a collection of translation pairs, $\mathcal{D}$.

Result: A transducer that has been onwarded at x .

```

 $VAC(\mathcal{D}, x, X_\ell) \rightarrow A$ 
 $TESTVPS(x, A, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow P$ 
 $e_x * P \rightarrow e_x$ 
for  $y \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{D}) \wedge x < y$  do
   $P^{-1}e_y \rightarrow e_y$ 

```

After executing Algorithm 4, all translation that is done after x and can be advanced to before x has been advanced.

6.2.4. Merging states. During the learning process, we will label states as **RED** states if it is not possible to merge them with any $<_{lex}$ -lesser state. Initially, only the input state, q_λ , is a **RED** state. We proceed through the states in $<_{lex}$ -order. When a new state is found that cannot be merged with any **RED** state, then it becomes a new **RED** state.

The next algorithm we present merges two states if there is no evidence that the underlying grammar behaves differently on extensions of the inputs of the two states. In this operation, we assume that the first argument is a **RED** state, the second argument is not, and that onwarding has already been performed for both states. In order to present the algorithm succinctly, we define a function similar to *COMPARE* from Section 6.2.2. Define

$FUTURE(x, y, G, \mathcal{D}) = \text{TRUE}$ if

$$(\forall X \in G[p_x] \cap \text{ran}(\mathcal{D}), Y \in G[p_y] \cap \text{ran}(\mathcal{D}), \langle z, Z \rangle \in \mathcal{D}) \left(\begin{aligned} &(x \leq z \wedge X \leq Z \rightarrow [y(x^{-1}z), Y_0(X^{-1}Z)]_f = \text{TRUE}) \\ &\wedge (y \leq z \wedge Y \leq Z \rightarrow [x(y^{-1}z), X_0(Y^{-1}Z)]_f = \text{TRUE}) \end{aligned} \right),$$

where $X_0 = LLEX - LEAST(G[p_x])$ and $Y_0 = LLEX - LEAST(G[p_y])$. Otherwise, $FUTURE(x, y, G, \mathcal{D}) = \text{FALSE}$. Note that finding $LLEX - LEAST(G[p_x])$ does not require enumeration all elements of $G[p_x]$, which could be exponential in the length of x . To determine $LLEX - LEAST(G[p_x])$, one need only find the least element of each set of translations along the path p_x .

Algorithm 5: MERGE

Data: A RED state, q_x ; a non-RED state, q_y ; a transducer, G , that is tree-like below q_y ; a collection of translation pairs, $\mathcal{D}$.

Result: A transducer; a boolean value of TRUE if the two states have been merged and FALSE otherwise.

$FUTURE(x, y, G, \mathcal{D}) \rightarrow \text{status}$

```

if status =  $\text{TRUE}$  then
   $q_x \rightarrow o(e_y)$ 
  STATES[G] \ { $q_y$ }  $\rightarrow$  STATES[G]
  for  $z \in \text{dom}(\mathcal{D}) \wedge z > y$  do
    for  $y < \hat{z} \leq z$  do
      if  $q_{xy^{-1}\hat{z}} \in \text{STATES}[G]$  then
        STATES[G] \ { $q_{\hat{z}}$ }  $\rightarrow$  STATES[G]
         $q_{xy^{-1}\hat{z}} \rightarrow \text{start}(e_{\hat{z}})$ 
         $q_{xy^{-1}\hat{z}i(e_{\hat{z}})} \rightarrow \text{end}(e_{\hat{z}})$ 
    return  $\langle G, \text{TRUE} \rangle$ 
else
  return  $\langle G, \text{FALSE} \rangle$ 

```

If G is a transducer generated from a dataset, it is likely that G will include non-equivalent states for which there is no evidence in their futures to distinguish them. Ultimately, this will not be an obstacle to learning because if the characteristic sample has appeared, there will be enough data to distinguish earlier states that will be processed first.

6.2.5. *The learning algorithm.* Our final algorithm combines onwarding and merging into a single process. We proceed through the states of the initial transducer in $<_{lex}$ -order, first onwarding and then attempting to merge with lesser states. If a state cannot be merged

with any lesser state, it is fixed and will not subsequently be changed. The fact that such states are fixed is recorded by their membership in a set `RED`.

Algorithm 6: Learning an SDT

Data: A collection of translation pairs, $\mathcal{D}$.
Result: A transducer.
 $G_0 = \text{INITIAL}(\mathcal{D})$
 $S = \text{LLEXORDER}(\text{STATES}[G_0])$
 $\text{RED}[0] = q_\lambda$
 $i = 0$
for $q_x \in S$ **do**
 if $q_x \in \text{RED} \vee q_{x^-} \notin \text{RED}$ **then**
 $\perp$ **continue**
 else
 $G = \text{ONWARD}(x, G, \text{LLEX} - \text{LEAST}(G[p_x]), \mathcal{D})$
 for $q_y \in \text{RED}$ **do**
 $\langle G, \text{status} \rangle = \text{MERGE}(q_y, q_x, G, \mathcal{D})$
 if $\text{status} = \text{TRUE}$ **then**
 $\perp$ **break**
 if $\text{status} = \text{FALSE}$ **then**
 $\text{RED}[i] = x$
 $i++$

6.3. Learnability of SDBLs.

Theorem 6.3. *The class of SDBLs is polynomial identifiable in the limit with translation queries.*

Proof. Let f be an SDBL and $\mathcal{D}$ be a collection of translation pairs generated by f and containing CS_f . We apply Algorithm 6 to learn f from $\mathcal{D}$. To prove that Algorithm 6 identifies f in the limit in polynomial time, we must verify three claims. First, we must show that the size of the chosen characteristic sample is polynomial in the size of the canonical grammar of the target. Second, we must show that the algorithm terminates within a number of steps that is polynomial in the size of the canonical grammar of the target and in the size of the given data. Third, we must show the SDT produced by Algorithm 6 generates f .

The first claim is easy. As noted in the section in which CS_f was defined, $N_0(f)$, $N_1(f)$ and $N_2(f)$ are all polynomial in the size of G .

An inspection of the algorithms shows that they converge in polynomial time. Although a large number of translation queries will be made, it is still bounded by a power of the size of the data. We conclude that the second claim is true.

Finally, we prove the third claim. We must verify that every onwarding and merging decision made by the algorithm is correct. Suppose that we are considering an input string x and that the current transducer is tree-like in the future of x . If x is the minimal path to a state of G (or an immediate extension of such a path) then Algorithm 2 generates an array of the valid antichains of the output tree of $\hat{x}$. Algorithm 3 determines which of those valid antichains are not consistent with the future of x . The characteristic sample is guaranteed to contain enough data for the array produced by Algorithm 2 to contain the correct valid antichain and for Algorithm 3 to eliminate all greater valid antichains from consideration. If x is the minimal path to a state of G , then the state will not be merged. If

it is an immediate extension, then the characteristic sample provides enough data to make the merging decision. If x is neither, then onwarding and merging decisions will not have to be made about x as the decisions about previous states will obviate the need. Since all merges and onwardings are performed correctly and the maximum number possible are performed, the resulting transducer must generate f . $\square$

7. CONCLUSION

We have presented a novel algorithm that learns a powerful class of transducers with the help of reasonable queries. A probabilistic version of these transducers was defined in [1]. We are unaware of any results involving this version. As both probabilities and translation queries can serve the purpose of answering questions about translation pairs not present in the given data, it seems possible that probabilistic transducers could be learned without translation queries, with statistical analysis taking the role of translation queries.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. I. Akram. *PhD*. PhD thesis, Technische Universität München, 2013.
- [2] C. Allauzen and M. Mohri. p-subsequential transducers. In *Implementation and Application of Automata, 7th International Conference, CIAA 2002, Revised Papers*, volume 2608 of LNCS, pages 24–34. Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [3] J. C. Amengual, J. M. Benedí, F. Casacuberta, A. Castaño, A. Castellanos, V. M. Jiménez, D. Llorens, A. Marzal, M. Pastor, F. Prat, E. Vidal, and J. M. Vilar. The EuTrans-I speech translation system. *Machine Translation*, 15(1):75–103, 2001.
- [4] D. Angluin. Queries and concept learning. *Machine Learning Journal*, 2:319–342, 1987.
- [5] M. Bernard, J.-C. Janodet, and M. Sebban. A discriminative model of stochastic edit distance in the form of a conditional transducer. In Sakakibara et al. [32], pages 240–252.
- [6] A. Beros. Anomalous vacillatory learning. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 78(4):1183–1188, 12 2013.
- [7] A. Beros. Learning theory in the arithmetic hierarchy. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 79(3):908–927, 9 2014.
- [8] J. Berstel. *Transductions and context-free languages*. Teubner, Leipzig, 1979.
- [9] J. Carme, R. Gilleron, A. Lemay, and J. Niehren. Interactive learning of node selecting tree transducer. In *ICAT Workshop on Grammatical Inference*, 2005.
- [10] F. Casacuberta and C. de la Higuera. Optimal linguistic decoding is a difficult computational problem. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, 20(8):813–821, 1999.
- [11] F. Casacuberta and C. de la Higuera. Computational complexity of problems on probabilistic grammars and transducers. In de Oliveira [18], pages 15–24.
- [12] F. Casacuberta and E. Vidal. Machine translation with inferred stochastic finite-state transducers. *Computational Linguistics*, 30(2):205–225, 2004.
- [13] A. Castellanos, E. Vidal, and J. Oncina. Language understanding and subsequential transducer learning. In *International Colloquium on Grammatical Inference*, pages 11/1–11/10, 1993.
- [14] A. Clark. Partially supervised learning of morphology with stochastic transducers. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Natural Language Processing Pacific Rim Symposium*, pages 341–348, 2001.
- [15] A. Clark. Large scale inference of deterministic transductions: Tenjinno problem 1. In Sakakibara et al. [32], pages 227–239.
- [16] F. Coste, D. Fredouille, C. Kermorvant, and C. de la Higuera. Introducing domain and typing bias in automata inference. In G. Paliouras and Y. Sakakibara, editors, *Grammatical Inference: Algorithms and Applications, Proceedings of ICGI '04*, volume 3264 of LNAI, pages 115–126. Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- [17] C. de la Higuera. Characteristic sets for polynomial grammatical inference. *Machine Learning Journal*, 27:125–138, 1997.
- [18] A. L. de Oliveira, editor. *Grammatical Inference: Algorithms and Applications, Proceedings of ICGI '00*, volume 1891 of LNAI. Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [19] E. M. Gold. Language identification in the limit. *Information and Control*, 10(5):447–474, 1967.
- [20] C. Kermorvant and C. de la Higuera. Learning languages with help. In P. Adriaans, H. Fernau, and M. van Zaannen, editors, *Grammatical Inference: Algorithms and Applications, Proceedings of ICGI '02*, volume 2484 of LNAI, pages 161–173. Springer-Verlag, 2002.
- [21] C. Kermorvant, C. de la Higuera, and P. Dupont. Improving probabilistic automata learning with additional knowledge. In A. Fred, T. Caelli, R. Duin, A. Campilho, and D. de Ridder, editors, *Structural, Syntactic and*

- Statistical Pattern Recognition, Proceedings of SSPR and SPR 2004*, volume 3138 of LNCS, pages 260–268. Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- [22] K. Kunen. *Set theory*, volume 102 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York, 1980. An introduction to independence proofs.
 - [23] L. Miclet and C. de la Higuera, editors. *Proceedings of ICGI '96*, number 1147 in LNAI. Springer-Verlag, 1996.
 - [24] M. Mohri. Finite-state transducers in language and speech processing. *Computational Linguistics*, 23(3):269–311, 1997.
 - [25] M. Mohri. Minimization algorithms for sequential transducers. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 234:177–201, 2000.
 - [26] M. Mohri, F. C. N. Pereira, and M. Riley. The design principles of a weighted finite-state transducer library. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 231(1):17–32, 2000.
 - [27] J. Oncina, P. García, and E. Vidal. Learning subsequential transducers for pattern recognition interpretation tasks. *Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 15(5):448–458, 1993.
 - [28] J. Oncina and M. A. Varó. Using domain information during the learning of a subsequential transducer. In Miclet and de la Higuera [23], pages 301–312.
 - [29] C. Reutenauer and M.-P. Schützenberger. Minimization of rational word functions. *SIAM Journal of Computing*, 20(4):669–685, 1991.
 - [30] C. Reutenauer and M.-P. Schützenberger. Variétés et fonctions rationnelles. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 145(1&2):229–240, 1995.
 - [31] B. Roark and R. Sproat. *Computational Approaches to Syntax and Morphology*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
 - [32] Y. Sakakibara, S. Kobayashi, K. Sato, T. Nishino, and E. Tomita, editors. *Grammatical Inference: Algorithms and Applications, Proceedings of ICGI '06*, volume 4201 of LNAI. Springer-Verlag, 2006.
 - [33] J. Sakarovich. *Elements of Automata Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
 - [34] B. Starkie, M. van Zaanen, and D. Estival. The Tenjinno machine translation competition. In Sakakibara et al. [32], pages 214–226.
 - [35] L. G. Valiant. A theory of the learnable. *Communications of the Association for Computing Machinery*, 27(11):1134–1142, 1984.
 - [36] J. M. Vilar. Query learning of subsequential transducers. In Miclet and de la Higuera [23], pages 72–83.
 - [37] J. M. Vilar. Improve the learning of subsequential transducers by using alignments and dictionaries. In de Oliveira [18], pages 298–312.

(A. Beros) LABORATOIRE D'INFORMATIQUE DE NANTES ATLANTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE NANTES, 2 RUE DE LA HOUSSINIÈRE
BP 92208, 44322 NANTES CEDEX 03, FRANCE,
E-mail address: achilles.beros@univ-nantes.fr

(C. de la Higuera) LABORATOIRE D'INFORMATIQUE DE NANTES ATLANTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE NANTES, 2 RUE DE LA
HOUSSINIÈRE BP 92208, 44322 NANTES CEDEX 03, FRANCE,
E-mail address: cdlh@univ-nantes.fr